DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 188 HE 000 123

By- Blackwell, Gordon W.

Higher Education in the South in the Next 20 Years.

Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
Pub Date 68
Note- 48p.; Paper in The Future South and Higher Education, 1968, Southern Regional Education Board, Atlanta, Ga.
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $2.50
Descriptors- *Economic Development, Educational Equality, *Educational Innovation, *Higher Education, Industrial Education, Private Colleges, *Southern Schools, State Universities, *Universities, University Administration
Identifiers- *Southern Regional Education Board

It is difficult to perceive what the South will be like in 1988, but one may generally expect increased urbanization, industrialization, a more complex society, and more leisure time. Trends already indicate a decreasing proportion of labor employed in goods-producing industries and a greater demand for workers in professional, technical and service industries. Education's role in economy should be to develop the quality of human resources necessary to keep up with and influence the region's growth. On the basis of current goals, the forecast for higher education might be: approximately 60% of the eligible population will be attending college (still a lag behind the national level); some private institutions will have become state institutions and others will have closed in bankruptcy; publicly controlled institutions will claim 85% of the region's college students; more than 50% of the Negro students will be enrolled in other than traditionally Negro institutions; acceleration of graduate education will continue, particularly in research; tuition will have tripled in both private and public institutions, but state and federal aid for students will have increased; academic innovations will be more acceptable; college and trustee roles will be more precisely defined and closely related to their institutions; there will be more planning and coordination of interstate university programs; admission and retention standards will be published by all institutions so that students may take advantage of the region's variety of curricula. (WM)

HIGHER EDUCATION IN THE SOUTH IN THE NEXT 20 YEARS

By Gordon W. Blackwell
President
Furman University

ED025188

There is no way of knowing, of course, what the size and shape of higher education in the South will be in 1988. But there are many changes already under way which indicate some of what it may be, and there are many goals already enunciated which, if attained, will affect what it becomes. Combining the anticipated impact of trends and goal-seeking efforts, it is possible to forecast that Southern higher education 20 years from now will look something like this:

Opportunity. Higher educational opportunity will have been extended to a much larger proportion of the South's college-age population, perhaps 60 percent, although the region will still lag behind the rest of the nation in this regard. Similarly, many more Negroes will be attending college, but the proportion still will fall short of that for the white college-age population. Public community colleges will have expanded so rapidly that 90 percent of the people in the South will live within an hour's drive of such a democratizing institution.

Institutions. The trend toward concentration of enrollments in publicly controlled institutions will continue, with the public sector claiming possibly 85 percent of the region's college students by 1988. Some private institutions will have closed in bankruptcy, and some others will have become state institutions. The traditionally Negro universities and colleges will still bear heavy responsibility, but more than half of the South's Negro college students will be enrolled in other institutions.

HE000 123

ED025188

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Curriculum. There will be a continuing rapid acceleration of the number and quality of graduate education programs, but the South still will lag at this level. The greatest growth will come in the vocational and technical programs at the community colleges and in the continuing education programs for adults at all types of educational institutions.

Financing. Tuition costs will have climbed perhaps threefold at both private and public institutions, but there will have been corresponding increases in student aid budgets. Both state appropriations and private support for higher education will have soared due to enhanced understanding of the crucial role played by colleges and universities in national and regional development. Likewise, state assistance for private institutions will have increased and will include not only state scholarships for resident students, but support for operations and grants for capital purposes. Federal aid will be much more extensive at all levels of higher education and in both private and public sectors. It will be especially heavy in support of research and graduate education, and may approach half of the total budget needs of higher education. By that time, the federal government will have adopted the technique of block grants for general support of institutions, with a corresponding drop in emphasis on categorical aid.

Quality. The South, by 1988, will have narrowed the gap in quality between itself and other regions of the nation, but the gap will still exist when measured by expenditures in both public and private institutions. Faculty salaries still will fall below national averages in most types of institutions, but the lag will be less pronounced. As a result of improved salaries, the South will claim a larger proportion of faculty with the doctorate, although it will not match the national percentage. Two or three Southern universities, public and private, will achieve national distinction. There will have been judicious increases in student-faculty ratios of 15 to 20 percent, without diminishing educational quality, through the use of electronic teaching aids, undergraduate students as teaching aides, and increased clerical assistance for faculty.

Students. Among Southern college students, there will be an increasing proportion who are intellectually keen, serious, ur-

bane, demanding educational relevance, socially and politically concerned, militantly active, and aware of their stake in the social system. At the same time, they will be hesitant, uncertain about the future, emotionally disturbed, cut off from the usual primary group controls of home, church and community, and questioning the tenets of religion, morality and other mores.

Administration. There will be increased acceptance of academic innovations ranging from new curricular patterns, new academic calendars and new teaching methods to different criteria for admission. The role of college and university trustees will have been more clearly defined and will include more effective ways of relating them to their institutions, in spite of continuing problems in relation to legislatures and sponsoring religious denominations. Trustees, college administrators and the public will bestow greater acceptance on the principles of academic freedom and desirable methods of implementing these principles. There will be greater and more meaningful faculty and student participation in institutional governance, improvement of both internal and external communication in institutions, adoption of modern tools of business management which are appropriate to educational institutions, increased attention to institutional research, and the development of more effective planning techniques.

Planning and coordination. Far greater attention will be paid to the planning and coordination of higher education at national and regional levels. There will be increased voluntary cooperation between institutions of similar type, resulting in strengthened programs and more economical operation. The necessity and wisdom of statewide planning and coordination of higher education, including both public and private institutions, will have gained wide public acceptance. Each state will have determined the most desirable institutional mix to maximize its contributions to higher education. At each institution, the proper student mix by level—lower division, upper division, graduate—will have been determined. States will give careful nurture to private institutions because of their valuable contributions to statewide systems of higher education. There will be general avoidance of wasteful and unnecessary duplication in costly educational programs, special library services, research, publication

and continuing education. Many so-called state universities will of necessity confine their programs to those appropriate to strong senior colleges. Admission and retention standards will be published by all institutions in order to help prospective students distribute themselves appropriately throughout a diversified statewide system.

The Perspective

To foretell the future, it is necessary to understand the past and to interpret the present. Higher education in the South, according to most indices of quality and quantity, lags behind higher education in the nation as a whole. Still, in the years since the end of World War II, Southern higher education has traveled a great distance, and many of the accomplishments, the trends and the forces at work during this period will figure strongly in the region's progress in the years ahead.

The South, as well as the rest of the nation, has felt the impact in these post-war years of international tension; competition in space exploration; the explosions of knowledge, technological advancement and population; the civil rights movement and racial disharmony; the phenomenon of "instant communication" by Telstar and television.

All of these forces have had a profound effect on higher education. Instant communication alone has been instrumental in developing a new kind of youth in American society, youth which is socially and politically aware, and the impact of this new youth on higher education and other social institutions will escalate in the years ahead, as an increasing share of the population falls into the "under 30" age group.

The effects of these forces on higher education in the South have been less dramatic than elsewhere in some cases, more dramatic in others. Until this spring, for example, the civil rights movement had a more profound effect on universities and colleges in the South than in other regions.

What will the South be like in 1988? It can be said with confidence that there will be increased urbanization and industrialization, a growing complexity in society, larger amounts of leisure time and even greater rapidity of change. It is also fairly certain that there will be continuing world insecurity,

and that the polarization of power, domestically and internationally, will continue.

If these are among the more fixed longitudes on the map of the future, what are the latitudes for regional growth? Higher education and regional development are increasingly interrelated. Natural resources grow less important than human resources, and the quality of human productivity is largely determined by the institutions developed to meet human needs. In like manner, technological advance is primarily the result of scientific and educational institutions. Indeed, developed and harnessed brain power has become the touchstone of regional growth.

In the economic development of a region, education is basic and crucial. No other institution can so raise the quality of human resources by more fully developing capabilities, motivations and aspirations. Education can thereby exert a direct influence on the kinds of industries which will successfully evolve within a region. Beyond this, university research centers can play a large part in solving special scientific and technological problems in working partnership with industry, as seen in the Research Triangle in central North Carolina. Ultimately, through service to people, industries and communities, education can provide regional development its single most vital thrust.

Harbison and Myers, in one of the more penetrating studies of education's relation to economic growth, have said that the development of human resources "is the process of increasing the knowledge, the skills and the capacities of all the people in a society. In economic terms, it could be described as the accumulation of human capital and its effective investment in the development of an economy."[1]

In the South's maturing economy, education beyond the high school level can hasten the trends which are already at work changing the employment mix. These occupational trends include a decreasing proportion of the labor market employed in goods-producing industries and a higher proportion in professional, technical and service industries, where higher levels of education are much in demand, if not required. At the same

[1] Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myers, *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1964), p. 2.

time, automation is reducing the proportion of workers in semi-skilled and unskilled jobs. Fully three-fourths of those in technical and professional occupations have some college work, and employment in scientific and engineering fields has skyrocketed.

With increasing emphasis on white-collar jobs in the South, education's role in upgrading workers grows vastly more important and demanding and may properly be viewed as the most basic kind of investment.

Economist Theodore W. Schultz has pointed out that investment is the "formation of capital, whether in the form of material things or in human capabilities."[2] In stimulating the economic growth of a region, it is necessary to make policy choices among investment opportunities, including education. Not until the region understands that support of education must be viewed as an investment, rather than a consumable item, will it utilize education wisely in economic development. Among other perspectives, education must be evaluated as capital formation which contributes to economic growth.

Wherever the levels of both education and income are relatively low, as in the South, the return on investment in education is high. In other words, a million dollars invested in education in one of the Southern states will yield greater returns than if the investment were made in New York or California.

The Agricultural Policy Institute of North Carolina State University, in *Education: An Investment in the Future* (pages 16 and 17), has put it this way:

> Numerous studies show a strong positive relationship between the level of education of the inhabitants of states and the level of family income. The educational levels of the people of the South are below those of other regions. The 1960 census reports show that the median grade of school completed for the population 25 years old and over was 10.6 for the nation as compared to 9.6 for the South.
>
> One study showed that white workers in the North and West with no schooling earned twice as much as those in the South. However, as the level of education rose, the differential decreased. Whites in the South with some college education made almost as much as whites in the North and

[2] Schultz, "Underinvestment in the Quality of Schooling: The Rural Farm Areas" (paper prepared for the National Agricultural Policy Conference, College Station, Texas, September 15, 1964), p. 20.

West with similar education. At the level of four or more years of college, whites in the South were earning slightly more than whites in the other two regions. It is evident that the scarcity of highly trained people in the South has been severe enough to raise their income to parity with Northern and Western whites with the same amount of training.

These data indicate that returns to individuals from investment in education are relatively high in the South compared with other regions of the nation. The data also suggest an effective means of closing the income gap between the South and other regions is to increase the investment in education of the people of the region.

Theodore W. Schultz says, "When a person improves his capabilitiy, it represents an investment in human capital. Such an investment always entails cost; when it enhances the future earnings of the person, these earnings are the returns to what has been invested."[3] He points up the fact that human capital has become increasingly important in this technologically advanced economy and that the rate of return to investment has been higher than in non-human capital.

Michigan State's Arthur Mauch has concluded that "greater productivity born of education has been responsible for almost a fourth of our economy since 1910."[4] Mauch cites a 1956 study of educational costs to both family and government:

One year of elementary schooling	$ 300
One year of high school	1,400
One year of college	3,300

Of course, these costs have greatly increased during the past decade, but the magnitude of the differences between them has probably remained about the same. Mauch further cites a study by Schultz indicating that investment in elementary education yields an annual return of 30 percent, investment in high school 14 percent, and investment in college 12 percent. He comes up with an overall annual return on educational investment at all levels of 17 percent.

With young workers under 25 accounting for nearly half of the labor force, the role of education has become even more sig-

[3] Schultz, "Investing in Farm People," University of Chicago Office of Agricultural Economics Research, Paper No. 6303, February 11, 1963, p. 4.
[4] "Developing Human Resources for Economic Growth," No. 5, *Education and Training* (North Carolina State University, Agricultural Policy Institute, n. d.), p. 1.

nificant. During the 1950's, college enrollment increased by 40 percent; the increase in the 1960's is expected to be about 50 percent.

Mauch found that in 1961 the average income for males, aged 25 through 64, very graphically illustrated the impact of education in the job market-place:

Schooling	*Average Income*
Less than 8 years	$3,483
8 years	4,750
9-11 years	5,305
12 years	6,102
1-3 years of college	7,392
4 or more years of college	9,350

Mauch concluded that it was something more than coincidence that the 20 percent who have attended college hold over 70 percent of the jobs which pay $5,000 or more yearly.

Education is, of course, more than an economic investment in people, and measuring education's impact on regional development in strictly economic terms would be altogether one dimensional. There are the traditional values of education upon which our culture and all civilization are built. There are rampant diseases manifest in our society in racial discrimination, in growing delinquency and crime to which education can prove a major antidote. There are immediate national and international political problems that ask much in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom of a democratic nation. There are all of these and more; yet if education is to continue its traditional functions, if it is to respond to the new forces and problems of a dynamic regional society in a dynamic age, it must be solvent at all levels, and solvency is first and foremost an economic problem. The doomsday forecasters are predicting bankruptcy for a third of our independent colleges and universities in the next decade, not just in the South but throughout the nation, and obviously higher education must establish its economic capabilities and priorities. Here, the South can ill afford a fraction of "regional lag," or further neglect of the neglected.

What lies ahead over the next 20 years is a massive effort at every level and through every channel of education, and it must be determined now how this investment in people can be most wisely and profitably made in the South.

Availability of Higher Education

An official policy statement of the Commission on Goals for Higher Education in the South reads: "In a democracy, the individual comes first. We are irrevocably committed to the principle that every individual should have the opportunity to progress as far as his interests and capabilities will permit."

This is an admirable, almost indisputable position, and already the approach of high school education which is both universal and of greater, more uniform quality can be seen. Some who are farsighted, like Alvin Eurich, president of the Academy for Educational Development, can see the day when free education for those of ability will extend through junior college.

As eminently desirable as such goals may be, they give rise to a plethora of very bothersome, yet germane questions. Is there a point of diminishing returns at which free education becomes impractical? How far will the service dollar stretch? What of the magnitude of need for health services, where unit costs are increasing even more rapidly than in higher education? At what levels of higher education should emphasis be placed on extending availability of educational opportunity, and at what educational levels will social and economic return on investment be highest? Where does the investment emphasis belong—on quantity or quality? With college education both a status symbol and a draft deterrent, is a sizable proportion of our youth going to college who should not?

Unquestionably there is an urgent need to extend the availability of college and university training to those historically neglected: the rural population, women and minority groups, especially Negroes. And no one seriously believes that the optimum quantity in higher education has been reached, even for those not so neglected.

But what are the facts of availability? One of every five students in the South is so blessed in intelligence or talent or money that he can cross state lines to attend the college of his choice. The others, some of whom are equally blessed, attend schools within their state borders. But all are privileged. Nearly all of the colleges and universities are filled to capacity, and

most are overcrowded. Simply to be accepted as a student at such institutions is a matter for some rejoicing, because the great fact of availability in higher education today is fundamentally a simple equation: Availability equals enrollment.

For any region the proportion of college-age population enrolled in colleges and universities is significant. In 1950, 27 percent of the college-age students in the United States were so enrolled; in the South, only 19 percent. By 1965, the national proportion had climbed 20 percent, but the ratio in the South was up only another 16 percent. Many non-Southern states, of course, were ahead of the national average; California had fully 60 percent of its college-age people enrolled in higher education. Obviously, compared to other sections of the country, the South is lagging badly in the development of its human resources.

Still, the South's performance was not altogether reprehensible. Between 1955 and 1967 the number of students enrolled in Southern institutions rose 154 percent, from 650,000 to 1,700,000, a considerable achievement and a percentage increase in total number of students very much in line with the rest of the nation. Reasonable 1980 projections call for 2.9 million students in Southern college classrooms, or 56 percent of the age-eligible youth, but still less than the predicted 66 percent for the nation. By 1988, the South should enroll 60 percent of its college-age youth.

In the past decade, enrollment increases have varied for the different kinds of institutions. In spite of some increase at private institutions, there has been a perceptible shift in total enrollment to publicly supported colleges and universities. In 1950, approximately 62 percent of all U. S. collegians were at publicly supported schools. In 1966, the proportion had grown to 74 percent. This trend will continue, but at a decelerated pace, reaching perhaps 85 percent by 1988.

Southern states range from a low of 60 percent in public institutions in South Carolina to a high of 85 percent in Mississippi. Except in Arkansas and Mississippi, enrollment increase in the South has been most rapid in the growing numbers of public community colleges.

Ideally, higher education might be described as consisting of three tiers, with a broad base of two-year junior colleges, followed by the senior colleges and then the universities. The jun-

ior colleges, most of them publicly supported, comprehensive community colleges, are already important democratizing agents in higher education. As early as 1960, the Commission on National Goals for Education predicted that we could soon expect community colleges to take care of fully half of all students entering college for the first time. In Florida the junior college share had reached 59 percent by 1965.

Generally, junior colleges have three primary functions: terminal occupational training; basic lower division academic work, similar to the first two years in senior colleges and universities; and adult education.

Alvin Eurich and others believe that ultimately some universities and strong liberal arts colleges will abdicate their lower-division responsibilities and hand them over *en toto* to the community colleges. It is doubtful that such a revolution is likely within the next 20 years, and certainly the three functions of the junior college program are a positive answer to some very pressing availability problems.

"For the many Negroes and whites caught up in the poverty cycle," says Winfred Godwin, director of the Southern Regional Education Board, "the need for occupational education and training assumes almost overriding importance." Indeed it does, with the competition for jobs not likely to lessen. By 1980, there will be some three million new workers entering the labor market each year, and for the most part the jobs available will be increasingly complex and technical.

With its ability to produce skilled technicians, with its very active counseling and guidance programs, with its built-in capacity for lessening the student load of the senior colleges and universities, the community college is a remarkably versatile and powerful instrument which has just begun to prove its effectiveness against the South's economic and educational lag.

For the individual and the society it serves, the comprehensive community college offers short and long-term solutions that are practical and attractive enough to guarantee rapid growth over the next 20 years and thereby increase the ratio of students enrolled in publicly controlled institutions. By 1988, there should be a community college within an hour's drive of 90 percent of the South's population.

A survey published by the Southern Regional Education

Board in 1967 showed enrollment percentages in the South by level and type of control:[5]

	Public		*Private*	
	1955	*1965*	*1955*	*1965*
Universities	32.7%	29.9%	7.3%	6.3%
Senior Colleges	25.9	31.7	23.4	18.3
Junior Colleges	7.4	11.1	3.3	2.7

In an affluent society, where the spirit of criticism alarms nobody, Topsy-like growth is likely to find more implicit encouragement than any exhortations to maximize efficiency, but the South can ill afford such luxury, even at the junior college level. In the upper tiers of higher education, the distinction between the senior colleges and universities already is blurred. What must be established in each state is a rational determination of the kind of institutional mix which will maximize returns on both public and private investment in higher education.

Unhappily, even good high school students do not have unrestricted access to the institutions of the region which might best serve their talents and abilities. Except for the fortunate few, cost remains a major consideration, and tuition costs have been rising steadily, even in public institutions. The South is characterized by relatively low per-capita income; yet over the next 20 years, more private colleges will be facing bankruptcy, state governments will be grappling with increasingly critical financial problems, and tuition can be expected to climb at a faster rate than inflation. Tuition costs in both private and public institutions are likely to increase threefold in the next 20 years. For efficient use of our human and institutional resources, the dilemma is considerable, and greatly increased student aid, especially through scholarships, is clearly of the first priority.

Following World War II the Southern Regional Education Board was founded to help higher education in the South diagnose and treat some of its more chronic weaknesses, particularly in the availability of graduate and professional programs, where a near-vacuum had allowed the brain-drain to reach epidemic proportions.

In 1950, the South produced only 8.8 percent of the doctorates awarded in the nation. By 1966, some 50 Southern universities

[5] "Changing Patterns of College Attendance," *Financing Higher Education, No. 21* (Southern Regional Education Board), 1967.

offered the doctorate in one or more fields, and the South had nearly doubled its share of the national total. In 1966 more than 2,000 doctorates were awarded by Southern universities in 1,000 separate programs. The next 20 years must—and will—see an even greater expansion of graduate education opportunities in the region.

The Southern Regional Education Board discovered early that the opportunities for graduate study are closely related to the availability of research funds. In 1954, of federal funds expended for research in universities, the South received 15.8 percent; in 1958, 17.7 percent; in 1965, 18.4 percent. This upward trend will continue, and Southern universities will have a somewhat easier time establishing and sustaining graduate-level programs.

Encouraging as such growth may be, enrollment for advanced degrees, when related to population, shows many Southern states woefully lacking and the region as a whole still far behind other sections of the country. A major part of the difficulty lies in the limited availability of higher education to Southern Negroes. In 1966, approximately 46 percent of the South's white, college-age population was enrolled in higher education, but only 17 percent of the college-age Negroes. (In 1950, it was only eight percent.) Negroes constituted 23 percent of the South's population in 1966, but only 11.5 percent of its college students.

This quantity gap must and will be considerably narrowed over the next 20 years. The ideal would be the immediate establishment of a completely integrated system of higher education, but it must be recognized that more than 80 percent of the South's Negro college students now attend predominantly Negro institutions and that a large percentage of these students could not meet admissions standards of many of the predominantly white institutions.

To extend equal higher educational opportunity qualitatively and quantitatively to Negro students will require: (1) an all-out attack to alleviate economic and cultural deprivation; (2) a planned program to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education; (3) further integration of traditionally white institutions; and (4) substantial strengthening and further integration of the traditionally Negro institutions. There must be a concerted effort and heavy commitments from federal and state

governments, foundations, business and industry, else the South will continue to waste valuable human resources, and the majority of its Negro students will remain second-class scholars in second-class institutions. By 1988, however, it is likely that fewer than half of the South's Negro students will be attending the traditionally Negro institutions.

But equality of opportunity for the young is not enough. In our kind of society, in this last third of the 20th century, we cannot limit educational opportunities to the young alone. Leland Medsker, director of the Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, University of California at Berkeley, has said: "By 1980, most individuals will feel the necessity for . . . continuous or at least periodic identification with some type of educational institution on either a formal or informal basis. This will be so, both because of the amount of leisure time at their disposal and the complexity of the world about them."[6]

Many kinds of institutions will have a part in this effort with adults: public schools, community colleges, senior colleges, universities, the Agricultural Extension Service, business, industry, labor, home-study programs, educational radio and television, and so on. Opportunities must include occupational training as well as cultural enrichment. Though most of the effort will be below the senior college level, higher education at all levels must and will assume a significant share of the responsibility.

Currently, the some 30 percent of the nation's population and perhaps eight percent of its adult education programs, here is yet another stunning challenge to the South over the next 20 years. New, creative, imaginative programs will be required for occupational updating, community improvement and cultural-personal development.

The Quality Gap

Someday, it may be appropriate and meaningful to argue the merits of quality-versus-quantity in higher education. But for the South that time is distant. For the present, both quality and quantity are crucial.

Quality is a relative thing, difficult to measure, but there are

[6] In Edgar L. Morphet and Charles O. Ryan, *Implications for Education of Prospective Changes in Society* (Denver: Bradford-Robinson Printing Company, 1967), p. 121.

strong indications that, at every level and in every way, higher education in the South, with the possible exception of the community colleges, is still inferior in quality to the rest of the nation, just as the late Howard Odum was so forcefully warning in the 1930's.

One strong indication of the South's "quality gap" is a ranking of regions by level of support of higher education, both public and private, for the academic year 1967-68. The South ranks last, and the relative poverty of the predominantly Negro colleges, while carefully footnoted, is not the whole explanation.

In 1964-65 the average of state appropriations *per student* in public institutions in the South was $824, while the national average was $891—an eight percent gap. Southern state appropriations *per youth of college age* were also the lowest in the nation, ranging from South Carolina's low of $160 to Louisiana's high of $368.

Expenditures per student in Southern private institutions were even lower. (In fact, on most indices the lowest totem is usually occupied by the private denominational colleges, which are frequently Southern.) In 1960, the amount spent per student in private colleges and universities was 20 percent below the public institution average. The cost of "student education" (excluding research) on a per-student basis at private institutions dropped from 88 percent of the national figure in 1949-50 to 79 percent in 1959-60, and undoubtedly the relative quality of education suffered a comparable decline.

Percentages and comparisons do not, of course, tell the whole story. Absolute levels of support have been increasing, and remarkably, in some Southern states. Between 1965-66 and 1967-68, Virginia increased its appropriations per college-age youth by 83 percent; and between 1960 and 1965, the South as a whole began to close the gap in faculty salaries, though its $8,340 remains in last place for regional median salaries.

According to a study by the American Association of University Professors, at its rate of improvement in the mid-'60's, the South will require 25 years to eliminate the regional differential in faculty salaries at public universities, more than 35 years at public senior colleges, and more than 70 years at church-related colleges.

Additionally, the South is falling even further behind other

regions in the proportion of faculty members at four-year institutions who hold the doctorate, and there seems no likelihood of catching up by 1988. Here is the evidence:

Region	*1954-55*	*1962-63*
South	32%	43%
North Atlantic	39	54
Central States	36	51
West	44	55

Florida State University's Russell Middleton, among others, has pointed out that faculty recruitment in the South tends to be difficult because of the unfortunate image Southern states have acquired in academia as a result of low salaries, threats to academic freedom, political and church meddling, and the like.

For Allan M. Cartter, the South's quality gap is most critical at the graduate level. "Unless the South markedly improves its graduate education," he has said, "it will remain within the vicious circle of turning out mediocre scholars, teachers and researchers who will tend to perpetuate mediocre institutions."[7]

In 1964, in a study conducted for the American Council on Education, Cartter could not find a single Southern institution among the nation's 20 leading universities. Based on departmental ratings by college teachers, he found less than four percent of the "strong" or "distinguished" graduate departments located in the South. Though there were a few scattered peaks of excellence, little more than 10 percent of all graduate programs in Southern colleges and universities received either of the two top rankings:

	Rated "Strong" or "Distinguished"	
Field of Study	*In the United States*	*In the South*
Humanities	36.5%	16.7%
Social Sciences	27.9	8.1
Bio-sciences	31.5	9.6
Physical sciences	30.1	8.6
Engineering	35.0	10.3
All fields	31.8	10.2

If graduate education were stronger in the South, enrollment of graduate students would be higher. The one-way traffic out of the South by recipients of graduate fellowships who are given

[7] Allan M. Cartter, "Qualitative Aspects of Southern University Education," *Southern Economic Journal*, XXXII (July, 1965), p. 68.

free choice of university is a regional "brain drain" that the South cannot afford. Graduate students account for seven percent of college and university enrollment in the South but 11 percent in the nation as a whole. In 1964, the South produced 26 percent of the bachelor's and first professional degrees, 20 percent of the master's degrees, and 16 percent of the doctor's degrees.

Cartter urged that ". . . Southern higher education must become quality-conscious or be left behind." In order to achieve that quality, the South must mount an attack with three major objectives: (1) closing the faculty salary gap; (2) strengthening graduate education in *selected* universities, rather than spreading meager resources over the many for political reasons; and (3) raising the level of aspirations of Southern higher education.

All of these objectives must be reached if the South is to close the quality gap. Undoubtedly, all will offer difficulties; but it may be that fiscal obstacles are so well entrenched that progress on the first front will be exasperatingly slow, and politics in all probability will continue to be a handicapping factor in state higher education systems. Nevertheless, there are several state and private universities which stand near the threshold of greatness by national standards and have a chance of achieving true national stature in the next 20 years. Chances appear good that two or three of them will make the grade.

Throughout the country, costs in higher education have increased at an alarming rate for fundamentally the same reasons. There are increasing enrollments and a higher proportion of students proceeding further toward undergraduate and advanced degrees. There are inflationary prices for everything, including immensely expensive instructional and research equipment. There is the relative inability of higher education to increase production and thus cut per-unit costs. There are all these elements, and more, in the spiraling costs of higher education. Then there are faculty salaries.

Faculty salaries have been increasing at the rate of five to seven percent a year and already represent about 50 percent of the budget in most colleges and universities. To ask the South to do more than hold its own with cost increases, and at the same

time to squeeze 25 or 35 or 70 years of salary progress into anything resembling a crash program, may be very much like asking Atlas if he would mind holding another planet.

Financial pressures over the next 20 years certainly will force experiments with new concepts and a thorough testing of the old, some of which may have been too long inviolate. Everything in this 20th century seems possible. Undoubtedly faculty salaries must rise in order to keep well-prepared understudies in the wings, and if costs are to be controlled at all (expenditures tend to quadruple with a doubling of enrollment), it would seem that judicious increases of 15 to 20 percent in student-faculty ratios are inevitable.[8] This can be accomplished, without diminishing educational quality, through various means, including use of electronic teaching aids, use of undergraduate students as teaching aides, and providing more clerical assistance for faculty.

Princeton economist William J. Baumol has developed an interesting explanation of rising costs in higher education as well as the performing arts.[9] He points out three facts in the cost structure of colleges and universities which, when analyzed together, would seem to constitute a paradox: (1) Income of faculty members, while increasing over the years, has nevertheless lagged behind incomes in the economy as a whole, and has yet to catch up; (2) approximately half the educational and general budget of a college is composed of faculty salaries; (3) costs of higher education have been rising phenomenally, not just in total but on a per-student-year or per-credit-hour basis, in relation to costs in the economy as a whole. As a matter of fact, costs per unit in higher education have gone up on the order of seven percent per year compounded. According to Baumol, "What that means is that costs per student double about every decade. It means that, although the universities have increased their tuitions sevenfold since the 1920's, even though they have been able to raise funds that are unprece-

---

[8] Some increase now would appear feasible. Compared to the rest of the nation, according to projections by the U.S. Office of Education, the South will average about five percent fewer students per faculty member through 1971.

[9] "The Economist Analyzes Orchestra Finance," mimeographed, n.d.

dented in the history of education . . . institution after institution finds itself in financial difficulties."

Mismanagement? Inefficiency? Probably not, because the costs in higher education are rising faster than in the overall economy. The primary reason, Baumol believes, lies in the irreducible personal element in production. As opposed to manufacturing, relatively little can be done about lowering production costs in higher education.

In manufacturing productivity has gone up consistently, constantly and cumulatively—2.5 percent per year compounded since the middle of the 19th century, and between three and four percent compounded during the 1960's. Wages have risen very much in line with increased productivity in manufacturing and in most other segments of the economy.

But in education there has been little increased productivity to cover the salary increases that have been necessary. In the past 10 years, faculty salaries have risen an average of about six percent a year, largely because of supply and demand in higher education's competition with business, government and other employers for academic personnel. And herein lies the nub of the cost squeeze.

Baumol suggests that this problem is the price of progress, and he points out that "the very process that generates these costs also generates the income of society out of which these costs can be met if the public is prepared and educated to do so."

We can only hope that Baumol is right. Public and private appropriations must and will be dramatically increased if the South is to make substantial progress in closing the quality gap, and it would certainly seem prudent to use every legitimate means and every available opportunity to help educate the public to a greater awareness of the vast importance of first-rate higher education to community and regional welfare.

In the meantime, there is much to do from within. Higher education must continue to upgrade its efficiency, both in management and operation, and to seek new and better ways to control the costs of production. In 1988, anyone who says, "If that college were a business, it would have gone bankrupt 20 years ago," will be a latter-day Rip Van Winkle. In 1968 *that* college

is getting ready to close its doors, even if the college doesn't know it.

Responsibility for Financing Higher Education

Clearly there are problems of both quantity and quality in Southern higher education. The South must and will have greatly expanded facilities, especially at the community college and graduate-professional levels. Financial support likely will continue to be inadequate with consequent inferiority in quality. But there must be improvement. Clearly, all segments of the regional society and the federal government will have to assume increased responsibility for supporting higher education.

General and educational income of U. S. colleges and universities in 1964 came from several sources:[10]

Source	*Type of Institution*	
	Public	*Private*
Tuition	16.4%	54.5%
Federal government (less research funds)	8.0	3.1
State and local governments	63.0	2.7
Private gifts and endowment earnings	3.9	29.0
Other income	8.7	10.7

As is generally known, private colleges and universities rely chiefly on tuition, private gifts and endowment earnings. Publicly controlled institutions look mostly to governmental appropriations. The differences are striking.

Private institutions in the South average about five percent less dependence on tuition than do those of the nation. However, the trends suggest that the private college of the future is likely to have a student body limited almost exclusively to affluent students and talented needy students who can qualify for financial aid.

University research, whether in public or private institutions, is now financed largely by the federal or state governments, and increasing support will become available from these sources over the next 20 years.

---

[10] "Sources of Financing," *Financing Higher Education, No. 20* (Southern Regional Education Board), 1966.

For the public institutions, the chief sources of funds for capital purposes are state and local governments (almost two-thirds) and institutional obligations (most of the balance), usually to be liquidated by student payments. For private colleges, the chief sources are gifts and grants (over half) and institutional obligations (one third).

As to student financial aid budgets, in both public and private institutions, half comes from the federal government, the next largest part from private gifts and endowment earnings, and a smaller portion from state governments.

Alan Pifer, president of the Carnegie Corporation, probably is correct that the chief answer to the financial problems of higher education must come from the central government: "If this nation's needs for higher education are to be met in the years to come, the federal government will have to accept the principal part of the consequent financial burden . . . It is my belief, however, that in the future a steadily rising proportion of the federal contribution will represent direct support for institutional operating and instructional costs and support for students."[11] Pifer goes on to say: "A coherent set of national policies would . . . be concerned with the overall functions, structure and financing of higher education, the quantity of it available, its quality and the degree of access to it."

Institutions throughout the nation have placed increasing reliance upon federal support:

Year	*Enrollment*	*Operating and Capital Budgets*	*Federal Share*
1955-56	2.6 million	$ 4.1 billion	12%
1966-67	6 million	$16.8 billion	23%
1975-76 *(estimated)*	9 million	$34-40 billion	30-50%

The obvious inelasticity of other sources of support in relation to the expansion of the educational task ahead explains this steadily increasing reliance upon federal aid and supports the belief that the trend will continue to 1988, when more than half the total budget of higher education will undoubtedly be derived from federal sources. Furthermore, block grants of federal

[11] Alan Pifer, "Toward a Coherent Set of National Policies for Higher Education," annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, Minneapolis, January 1968.

money to undergird the operation of private as well as public institutions will become common.

The concept of the national welfare provides still another rationale for federal support. If the nation is to remain strong in this scientific and technological age, it can ill afford for any sector of higher education to be weak or for any region to be less than good in its higher educational facilities. Equalization of educational opportunities for all individuals, regardless of their region or whether they choose to attend public or private institutions, is a reasonable goal for 1988.

But most of the responsibility for providing higher education in recent years has fallen to the states. The increasing academic stature of state universities and land-grant institutions, as well as the increase in proportion of students enrolling in these institutions, has been one of the great developments of this century. Yet the South has only four or five of these institutions which have attained ranking near the top within their group. The states must see the wisdom of greatly increased financial support for graduate and professional schools and, with local governmental support, for community colleges as well. Strengthening the highest segment of higher education is essential to nurture the research needed in regional development, as well as to educate future faculty for higher education and highly trained specialists for other areas of employment. Expansion and strengthening of community colleges is required so as to extend the opportunity for education beyond the high school level to a much greater proportion of our youth, preparing them either for technical or vocational occupations or for transfer to senior colleges.

But privately supported institutions likewise have a public responsibility. Recognizing this, a number of states are finding it advantageous to undergird their independent colleges with financial support. It is more economical for a state to provide financial aid to a well-established private college enrolling 2,000 of the state's residents than to enlarge a state institution by 2,000 students or build a new state senior college from scratch.

State aid for private colleges has taken several forms. First, of course, is tax exemption. Then there are state scholarships for students going into short-supply fields such as nursing or

teaching—or, in some states, into any field. Some states provide institutional grants, "tuition reduction supplements," or contracts with private colleges to enable them to hold student fees to levels where most residents of the state can afford the cost, as in 1965 Pennsylvania legislation. Finally, some states offer support for capital purposes at privately controlled institutions, as in Maryland and Pennsylvania.

There are thorny issues here which private institutions must face over the next 20 years. How much assistance from tax funds can a private college or university receive and still maintain its cherished independence? Is there an optimum point? How much control over what aspects of the institution must accompany public funds? What are the constitutional and practical questions relative to use of tax funds for non-religious purposes by church-related colleges? These and other issues must be faced squarely by both government and the private institutions in the years ahead. But clearly there must be much more tax support if the private sector of higher education is to remain strong.

In summary, if we are to preserve most of the private institutions and enable them to develop desirable levels of quality without pricing themselves out of the market with exhorbitant tuition, greatly increased support from all sources must be forthcoming. However, this requirement comes at a time when state colleges and universities also are rapidly expanding their efforts to secure private contributions. Competition for gifts is keen. One prediction is that one-third of our private colleges will go bankrupt in the next 10 years. Others will become publicly supported institutions. Still others will deteriorate in quality. There is no question but that a financial crisis is facing most private colleges and universities. Each of the Southern states should undertake the kind of study recently accomplished in New York State by the Bundy Commission in an effort to determine how to assure that the independent colleges make their maximum contribution to higher education.

Coordination and Planning in Higher Education

Up to this point the future of higher education in the South

appears strikingly complex. For this reason, institutional autonomy and voluntarism will not be adequate to assure the most effective and economical long-range development of higher education, public and private, to meet the needs of the South in the next 20 years. The needs are too great and the resources too scarce to allow for anything less than the most rational development. Financial pressures on the region, and on each of the states, will continue to be so great, and higher education so absolutely essential to the society's well-being, that the region can no longer afford the luxury of an unplanned, wasteful approach to higher education.

Until recently there was no organization or agency which gave any sustained attention to planning and coordination of higher education at the national level. True, there was the American Council on Education, the most effective and representative national agency, and in addition organizations like the Association of American Colleges, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges, the American Association of Higher Education, the Council of State Governments, the U. S. Office of Education. Of more significance in the present context is the recently formed interstate compact in education. The Education Commission of the States holds both promise and dangers as it seeks to carve out a role for itself which is both legitimate and helpful.

The pioneering—and most successful—attempt at regional planning and coordination of higher education has been the Southern Regional Education Board, discussed elsewhere in this volume.

In some Southern states, the independent colleges have banded together for purposes of coordination and planning. In South Carolina, for example, these coordinated activities already include joint fund-raising, a center for institutional research and planning, exchange of operational information, joint purchasing, sharing of speakers and musicians, coordinated library services, curriculum development, and cooperative foreign study programs. Stimulated by the availability of federal funds, colleges of various kinds have formed colloquia around the South which

are pursuing various objectives. There must be more of this kind of cooperative activity in the next 20 years.

Since most college students attend public institutions, and the proportion is expected to increase, there should be and there will be more attention to official higher education planning by the states. Several types of agencies are now carrying out this function, and here is the picture in the South:

Type of Agency	*Southern States*
Consolidated statewide governing board	Florida, Georgia, Mississippi
Coordinating board	Arkansas, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia
No agency	Alabama, Louisiana, West Virginia

Berdahl says the dilemma facing these agencies is "how to create an agency that can operate between state government and higher education and earn the continuing confidence of both."[12] The power of a state agency inevitably clashes with the traditional autonomy of each college and university.

Sooner or later, planning and coordinating agencies will find it desirable to develop a master plan for higher education in the state. Lyman A. Glenny has suggested certain criteria which must be met to justify this term "master plan":[13] (1) A variety of subjects is studied, not piecemeal planning; (2) there is considerable volume of data collecting; (3) analyses are made in depth; (4) there is integration of programs, budgets and building priorities to provide a unity of purpose; (5) there is full inclusion of private institutions; (6) step-by-step implementation of the plan is provided, with simultaneous review and revision leading to fulfillment of major goals.

To meet the challenge of our times and to plan in each state a

[12] Robert O. Berdahl, "The State Planning and Coordinating Agency for Higher Education," paper given at the Legislative Work Conference, Southern Regional Education Board, White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., August 27-9, 1967.

[13] Lyman A. Glenny, "State Systems and Plans," in Logan Wilson, ed., *Emerging Patterns in Higher Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1965), p. 91.

pattern of higher education commensurate with the needs of the 1970's and 1980's will require educational statesmanship of high order. The goal should be a comprehensive, coordinated, diversified pattern of higher education. There must first be knowledge of the general responsibilities of each of the private institutions due to the importance of preserving America's pluralistic pattern of higher education and of utilizing these institutions fully. Then the community colleges must understand clearly the dimensions of their mission. Finally, the state senior colleges and the state universities must understand and accept the responsibilities appropriate to each of these levels.

Such a statewide master plan, voluntary for the private institutions, will be revised and updated periodically. To some extent the publicly supported institutions, which must provide for most of the enrollment increases, can adjust their planning to the decisions of the private institutions, which thus need have no fear about maintaining their independence and having an important place under the sun.

Facts of demography and geography will affect a state's master plan. Population trends and enrollment projections for each section of the state must be analyzed. Future manpower needs of each of the state's economic areas must be considered in relation to probable resource development. Present availability of private institutions in each part of the state must be considered. Using these data, it can be determined where additional institutions should be located. Likewise the projected enrollment for future years for each school can be set.

Next, decisions as to type and functions of each of the institutions must be made. The wisest use of always too-meager financial resources requires control over what each public institution in the system is to undertake. A general principle is that the senior college will have more academic diversity than the community college, while the university will have even greater diversity.

The importance of the "personality" of individual institutions should be stressed. Coordination must not lead to equalization or standardization, but each component part of a statewide system should be permitted to maintain its distinct personality re-

flecting its unique history, type of students, faculty, leadership and particular strengths. There are very real assets in such diversity.

Assuming agreement that comprehensive community colleges are to provide terminal technical education, college preparatory work and adult education, decisions must be made as to the educational programs which are appropriate for the senior colleges. It is clear that purely technical and vocational curricula which do not require the baccalaureate degree should generally be left to the community colleges. Each of the senior colleges should offer the usual bachelor of arts and bachelor of science programs with majors in the arts and sciences which are common to most colleges. Unless a senior college exceeds an enrollment of 3,000, there will be a question as to whether undergraduate majors should be offered in certain of the arts and sciences in which enrollment and demand for graduates are small. Master's degree programs in some of the arts and sciences with larger enrollments, as well as in certain professional fields such as education and business, will often be appropriate for the senior colleges.

In the difficult process of allocating undergraduate and graduate instructional programs between the several senior colleges and the universities, the following primary variables must be considered: (1) manpower supply and demand, (2) student enrollment, and (3) costs. These secondary factors must also be taken into account: (4) optimum size for a program (the critical mass concept), and (5) total institutional capacity and desirable proportion of an institution's enrollment in a given area. In certain fields there may be serious manpower shortages, as in medicine, nursing or the other health professions. This would argue for duplication of programs. Yet the costs in these areas are high and adequate enrollment may be difficult to achieve. These factors argue against duplication. In areas where manpower demands are not great, such as agriculture and forestry, duplication cannot be justified regardless of costs or other considerations.

Working with these different factors, the problem of allocation of functions may be clarified by placing undergraduate in-

structional programs on a continuum which runs from one extreme (at the top), where there is the greatest likelihood that duplication in senior colleges and universities would be required, to the other extreme (at the bottom), where there would be least likelihood that more than one program would be required in a state. An example:

General Education
Arts and Sciences
Education
Business
Engineering
Nursing
Music
Home Economics
Agriculture

The continuum for graduate programs would look something like this:

Arts and Sciences
Education
Business
Engineering
Nursing
Music
Social Work
Library Science
Home Economics
Law
City Planning
Pharmacy
Medicine
Dentistry
Public Health
Veterinary Medicine
Agriculture
Forestry

In a rational plan, the senior colleges would operate programs only in certain fields which appear at the upper end of the undergraduate continuum and at the master's level in some of these same fields. Among the state universities—and few states have sufficient population and wealth to support more than two first-rate universities—undergraduate and graduate programs to the doctorate or the highest professional degree should be offered in all of the areas, with duplication between universities within a state less likely to be justified toward the lower end of the

continuum where the manpower demands are less and the costs higher. In fact, there is not presently a need in several of these fields for even one program in every state; SREB has shown that certain of these needs can be met through regional cooperation. Thomas R. McConnell has succinctly described the problem as follows:[14]

> Unfortunately, many institutions would prefer being a pale reflection of a prestigious university rather than a more limited institution of quality. Consequently, instead of finding their appropriate places in a diversified system of higher education, colleges and universities tend to converge rather than to diverge, to become more similar rather than more distinctive. By striving to be as much like one another as possible, institutions will fail to provide the diversity of educational opportunity that our economy, culture, and policy require.

Finally, the formerly racially segregated pattern of higher education in Southern states makes it difficult to achieve rational and therefore economical coordination of professional and graduate instruction. For example, it has been costly to attempt programs in predominantly Negro institutions in engineering, law and the health-related professions, as well as doctoral programs in the arts and sciences. Though some of these institutions bear the name "university," in reality most of them should be carrying the responsibilities of senior colleges and should be so recognized.

Another significant allocation of responsibility in a statewide system is determination of maximum enrollment at the several levels in each institution: lower division (freshmen, sophomores), upper division (juniors, seniors), and graduate. For example, in the master plan for higher education in California, the 1975 enrollment projections provide the following distribution by level:[15]

Level	*State Colleges*	*U. of California (all branches)*	*U. of California (Berkeley)*
Lower division	37%	24%	22%
Upper division	56	42	33
Graduate	7	34	45

The senior colleges in California have relatively greater respon-

[14] See Earl J. McGrath, ed., *Universal Higher Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Cmpany, 1966), p. 25.

[15] *A Master Plan for Higher Education in California 1960-1975* (Sacramento: Department of Education, 1960), Tables 25 and 26, pp. 102, 103.

sibility for undergraduate students, while the several branches of the University of California, especially at Berkeley and Los Angeles, concentrate much more at the graduate level. (The percentages for the University of California at Los Angeles are much the same as for Berkeley.) Some such allocation of enrollment by levels must be determined for each senior college and university in a state.

It is sometimes unpopular for a state university to freeze its freshman enrollment and control its growth in the lower division. However, this decision is necessary if the universities are to avoid unlimited growth, while at the same time fulfilling their proper role in accepting transfers from community colleges and in meeting graduate-level responsibilities. By 1988, most state universities in the South will have a larger junior than freshman class as was true for Florida State University as early as 1964.

With size and functions determined, an institution must still decide what its admission and retention standards shall be in light of the master plan. In a well-planned statewide system it is unwise to have uniform academic standards. Generally, private institutions will attempt to maintain somewhat higher standards since quality is their chief justification for higher tuition. In publicly supported community colleges, those students who are pursuing two-year terminal programs need not be able to meet the admission standards of the senior colleges or universities. The same is true to a lesser extent for those students who hope to transfer to a senior institution; some of these students always will be late bloomers. Similarly, the state senior colleges should have different standards for admission than the universities, without this differentiation having undesirable effect upon the quality of the colleges in relation to their purposes. With the predicted rapid growth of the community colleges, the senior colleges and universities will be able to upgrade their admission standards. Furthermore, different admission standards should be required for the several schools and colleges within a state university. Rather than reflecting intellectual snobbery on anyone's part, the goal is to help prospective students distribute themselves appropriately throughout a diversified statewide system of higher education so as to maximize their chances of academic success.

Likewise, academic standards for student retention and graduation may vary between the several tiers of a statewide system. Again, this need not reflect unfavorably upon any institution. There is no place for a pecking order among institutions.

But a statewide master plan should go beyond instructional programs. There can be economical coordination in other areas. For example, coordination in research should be approached by first making the assumption that some research is essential to maintain a viable teaching program at the undergraduate as well as the graduate level. Thus, one hopes that many members of the faculty in senior colleges will be pursuing research and creative activity. However, due to the specialized nature of research, its high costs and its essential relation to graduate education, the universities should clearly be the primary research centers.

Unnecessary duplication in research can be avoided through cooperation between universities. For example, in nuclear research the University of Florida and the Florida State University have found it advantageous to cooperate from the early planning stages. There has been a general allocation of nuclear research areas to each institution so as to develop a well-rounded program, while avoiding needless duplication of costly equipment. For some years, a joint faculty committee periodically reviewed the two programs and presented a single set of proposals to the Florida Nuclear Commission and the Board of Regents. There has been continuing intellectual companionship among members of the two faculties and some interchange of advanced students.

There should be much closer cooperation between higher education libraries over the next 20 years, involving interlibrary loan policies of unusual freedom, specialization of collections in certain fields, reproduction of out-of-print books and journals, divided responsibility for obtaining major foreign newspapers and important specialized scholarly and scientific journals, and the development of joint information storage centers with electronic retrieval of bibliography and research data.

A common program of publication can also support research in a statewide system. One possibility is a single press serving the state universities, as does the University of California Press, or possibly serving the statewide system of higher education. More

than one university press in a state, competing for appropriations and quality manuscripts, can hardly hope to attain excellence by national standards. Thoughtful consideration must be given to the functions of a university press and in what measures provincial publication should be mixed with universal scholarship. If the desire is to develop a really outstanding press, then there possibly should be only one within a state to serve the public universities and perhaps the public senior colleges as well. Of course, each major private university may wish to have its own press.

Continuing education, which will take on increasing significance in the next 20 years, includes off-campus credit ocurses at both the undergraduate and graduate levels, television credit courses, adult education programs including short courses and conferences, subcollegiate programs which may be offered on or off-campus, and radio and television broadcasting for general cultural purposes. This has generally been the last area in which coordination is attempted in a statewide system.

Factors such as (1) effective demand for continuing education in various areas of the state, (2) geographic location of the institutions, (3) costs, and (4) relative strength of the different institutions in particular fields must be considered in mapping a comprehensive, flexible, yet coordinated statewide program of continuing education.

To some extent, the initial allocation of on-campus instructional programs should be reflected in the programs of continuing education which are authorized for an institution. There also should be some geographic allocation where several institutions offer the same programs due to widespread demand.

There is inevitably the problem of seeing that legitimate needs for off-campus programs are met, while at the same time assuring that the overall program of an institution is kept academically sound and in balance. Pressing demands for off-campus graduate programs from either industry or the public schools should not lead institutions to rush into establishing educational programs of questionable quality. Yet the next 20 years will see much closer working relationships between higher education and business, industry, the public schools and other kinds of institutions.

Florida and Oregon offer examples of states where not only statewide coordination but centralized authority for administration of continuing education has been developed for a system of higher education. For example, the Florida Institute for Continuing University Studies had the responsibility for all off-campus credit programs offered by the state universities, as well as all non-credit work on the university campuses. The institute attempted to coordinate educational radio and television in the state. The effort was short-lived because there was not enough willingness to confine the institute's function to coordination and planning, and the autonomy of the universities was threatened.

In summary, each state needs a three-tiered system of higher education comprised of public community colleges, state senior colleges and one or more state universities. In determining the size and functions of each institution in such a system, the programs and plans of private colleges and universities must be considered. Coordination can be achieved within a statewide system through several means: (1) determination of the number, location and size of the publicly supported institutions; (2) allocation of instructional programs (baccalaureate, master's, doctor's) among the several institutions; (3) allocation to the several colleges and universities of enrollment by levels (lower division, upper division, graduate); (4) differentiation in academic standards among the institutions; (5) coordination of research programs and supporting functions such as library and publication; and (6) coordination of continuing education.

Development of a master plan for such a statewide system of higher education is fraught with many difficulties. Here are a few of the problems which may be expected.

Failure to integrate the privately controlled institutions into state planning is a frequent pitfall. This is to be regretted since these colleges have a significant contribution to make. The state agency must respect the autonomy of each independent institution, while the latter must be cooperative in providing requested information, in participating on planning committees, and in trying to determine how it can best fit into a rational plan for higher education. The problem of state control over independent college or university has already been discussed. Quoting A. J. Brumbaugh, a well-known participant-observer on the role of

statewide planning and coordination of higher education:

> Of special importance is the maintenance of effective liaison with private institutions. Private colleges and universities perform a public service even though they may not be under public support or control. Planning and coordinating agencies generally accept the private institutions as essential elements in a total plan of higher education, but in too many instances private institutions have little or no part in the process of planning and coordination by a state agency. Moreover, the state planning and coordinating agency should not merely assume the role of protector of the interest of the private institutions. One of its major concerns should be how to strengthen and improve them, for they are indeed a part of the state's total system of higher education.

The state governing or coordinating agency may fail to strike a proper balance in allocation of resources between the goals of quantity and quality. The concept of peaks of academic excellence in certain fields in one or two selected institutions may give way to political pressures to spread the money around, thus assuring widespread mediocrity. There may be failure to recognize the importance of both the technical training in the comprehensive community college and the Ph.D. program in aerospace engineering in the university, to use two widely different examples. Political pressures may lead to establishment of more state universities than can be supported at a level of excellence. For example, between 1950 and 1965, some 45 state colleges were renamed state universities, and one-third of these were in the South. Many of these probably should and will be offering only baccalaureate and master's degrees by 1988.

Separate boards of trustees and presidents must give up some institutional autonomy. Institutional dreams cannot be allowed to run ahead unbridled. Team play is essential if a statewide system is to be successful.

And those responsible for the central planning and direction must also take care. Authoritarian dictatorship is not becoming to any educational enterprise. Legitimate pride of trustees in "their institution" must be recognized. The dignity and integrity of the college or university presidency must not be destroyed, else the incumbent cannot successfully lead his faculty. And above all, staff in the central office of a state coordinating

agency must be experienced in higher education and of unusual sensitivity to the peculiarities of the academic community. They must not be susceptible to the urge for power or prone to allow Parkinson's laws of bureaucracy to take over.

When there is a single governing board for a statewide system, there are additional problems. Substitutes must be found for ways to fulfill some of the usual functions of an institutional board of trustees. One of these is the "crying towel function." On whose shoulder can the president cry, so to speak, when his problems appear to be insurmountable? To whom can he turn for informal advice when practically his only contact with a central governing board is in formal meetings open to the press? Furthermore, those on a single governing board can hardly develop the intimate familiarity with an institution, its personnel, its problems, its dreams—matters which are essential for wise governance. Members of a central board may find it difficult to participate in the honorific functions, such as convocations, dedications and commencements—functions which can be helpful in giving board members a feeling for the intellectual climate of an educational institution. In the state agency, budget authority tends to be wielded through mechanistic formulae far removed from realistic educational needs. Certainly, a single governing board for a statewide system has advantages in having the obvious power to achieve coordination, but the effect of this form of governance upon the several institutions should be carefully observed.

Such, then, seem to be the noble goals and the inherent difficulties in achieving carefully planned and well-coordinated statewide systems of higher education. Such coordination is essential for wise use of resources and strengthened educational programs. Informed legislators are in a unique position to exert leadership so as to develop optimum plans and programs of higher education for each of the Southern states over the next 20 years.

The New Student Generation

Up to this point the future of Southern higher education has been sketched in broad terms—regional development, investment of resources, statistical description of quantity and quality,

responsibility for financing, coordination, planning. It is time now to look at the educational process more directly, though still of necessity rather generally. What of the students? What of the dynamic processes within the college or university? What lies ahead concerning these matters?

At the beginning, reference was made to the development of a new kind of student as one of the significant phenomena setting the framework for an appraisal of Southern higher education over the next 20 years. Before considering changes and innovations which should take place in teaching, curriculum and institutional organization and management, what can be said of the students? Surely they appear somewhat differently to everyone due to his own background and biases, and to the nature of his contact with them. Certainly also, they are a mixed bag. Some generalization, however, may be possible, and trends of the past decade probably will accelerate during the next 20 years.

Today's college students—more serious than previous generations, sometimes more sophisticated, yet still frequently hesitant and uncertain—have a greater awareness of social and political issues, and what's more, some of them mean to do something about the world around them, though many are still apathetic. Some are not satisfied with debating the issue as students used to do in the 1930's, nor are as many of them far removed from the issues as students tended to be in the early 1950's. With the development of the civil rights movement and the war in Vietnam, a new and distinctive role has been assumed by many American youth. All this has been greatly abetted by the mass media of communication. Viewing his television screen, the student can feel that he is there in the demonstration or the riot. Or he can feel that he is in the war because of its dramatic daily reporting. Harold Taylor has described the phenomenon this way:[16]

> A more concerned generation began looking at its own place in society and began to be taken seriously by journalists, informal historians, and social critics, although not by educators. Not, that is, until the Berkeley protest, which served as the symbol for the coming of age of the American student body and for certain changes in the social system which gave to the younger generation more direct responsi-

[16] Harold Taylor, "The Student in Society," *Student NEA News*, April, 1967, pp. 4, 8.

bility and a place within the American community it had never had before . . . the young have a new awareness of their own stake in society. This is a new element in the social system and its educational counterpart.

Martin Duberman makes this point: "A growing minority of students is no longer willing to settle for mechanical exercises in which it has little interest and less control."[17]

Furthermore, the emotions of these students must be understood. A Hazen Foundation study in 1966 concluded that today's students are products of the "nerve-wracking culture that has been built in these United States."[18] This committee decided that perhaps 10 percent are constricted by serious emotional problems. Suicide on the campus is on the increase.

Today's students for the most part have grown up in an environment of affluence, not bread lines. Yet their future appears unclear to them due to international uncertainties. Military service is a likely prospect for many of the men, and the specter of nuclear annihilation brushes the minds of all. As urbanization and social change have accelerated, the generation gap has widened. Weakening of the primary group controls of home, church and community is equated with disrespect by the young for all authority.

A community of interest has developed among students who are linked together by communication systems. Many young people have volunteered in the Peace Corps, the National Teacher Corps, Head Start, VISTA, and the Job Opportunity Centers. Federal funds, under Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, have made possible student involvement in new volunteer and social action programs which demand new kinds of social activists, most of them young. National political heroes who identify with youth give them a rallying point. The black power movement will have to be reckoned with on many campuses for a long time to come.

Dean Bardwell L. Smith of Carleton College has put it this way:[19]

Berkeley in several periods stands for a wholesale protest

[17] In review of Theodore Roszak, ed., *The Dissenting Academy*, in the *New York Times*, March 17, 1968.

[18] *The Student in Higher Education* (New Haven: Hazen Foundation, 1968), page 18.

[19] Bardwell L. Smith, "Education for Serendipity," *Carleton College Voice*, Nov., 1967, p. 10.

against a society which is difficult to understand, often contradictory in its goals, and in many ways impossible to accept. At its core, student protest is part of a larger ferment within and against a social system, a system which in doing violence to human dignity evokes violence in return. There can be no question about Berkeley's focusing attention upon long-existing grievances—within the entire society, including its citadels of learning. What had once been chronic now became acute. "Alienation," "hypocrisy," "irrelevance," and the "academic rat-race" became slogans to this generation. While the new breed of student makes up a small fragment of today's campus, he does strike a chord of sorts in the vast majority, a chord which seeks to expose and subvert the false, the trivial, and the self-deceived.

As Barnaby Keeney, former president of Brown University, put it: "Students are troublesome people, and they should be. They are trying to figure out the way things are, and in doing that they disturb things. The main difference between students five years ago and the students now is that now they're trying to combine activism with study. This disturbs older people, of course. But . . . it may be a step toward ending the divorce between work and study." Yale psychologist Kenneth Kenniston writes: "This student generation probably has a greater potential for informed detachment, a higher sense of ethics, articulateness, and determination than any before. . . . Most important, they are eager to find some way of reconciling their private lives with their academic activities."

And finally, many students are questioning fundamental religious tenets, especially the organized church, and some of the long-accepted canons of personal conduct. Their ideas concerning the new morality, drinking, and use of drugs come into direct conflict with regulations in most college catalogues. The double standard for men and women is on the way out. There is little likelihood that these trends among students will be reversed in the next 20 years.

If these characterizations of the current student generation are at all accurate, think what an immense challenge it is to help them to develop their minds, to guide them toward maturity, and to prepare them for useful lives of leadership. Their usually serious purpose, their urge toward activism, their intense desire to improve society must be channeled into construc-

tive activity. Educators must not turn them off, or let them turn their elders off. What then are the implications of all this for Southern colleges and universities in the next 20 years?

Academic Innovations

Following a period in which there has been unprecedented rapidity in economic and social change, in scientific and technological development, and in the nature of college students, changes in the educational establishment must be widely initiated over the next 20 years. Colleges and universities must and will become hospitable to innovation. To an increasing extent, higher education will be recognized as a prime instrument of national purpose with the ethical, social, economic and political development of society increasingly dependent on colleges and universities. It's becoming that kind of world and that kind of region. How can Southern institutions become a force for the amelioration of problems brought on by urbanization? How can they effectively relate to industry and at the same time strengthen their academic programs? How can they relate to international problems and participate in processes of cross-fertilization with higher education in other countries? How can they become more relevant to student needs and individual growth, as well as to the demands of moral responsibility in contemporary society? How can higher education approach these problems with openness, flexibility and acceptance of the principle of change? These questions must be answered; there must be significant educational innovations.

Significant changes have taken place also in the structure of knowledge and in the production of a vast amount of new knowledge. For example, the new discoveries in molecular biology, genetics and cybernetics are striking. What are the implications of existential and participatory, rather than strictly objective, factors in new types of knowledge? What of the interdisciplinary areas in which research is extending the frontiers of new knowledge? What new structure of the curriculum may be superior to the traditional areas: natural sciences and mathematics, social sciences, humanities, and the fine arts?

The Hazen study, already referred to, reached this discouraging conclusion: "Students come to college with a great deal of

excitement and willingness to do the work demanded of them, but their expectations and performance usually decline very rapidly during the first months of the freshman year." If this is true, how sad! Things must be done differently in the colleges.

New understanding of how people learn and how teachers teach is providing a rational basis for academic innovation. Improvement in the quality of human relationships in the college is badly needed. Among other things, this will require far better integration of the cognitive and noncognitive dimensions of human growth. Experimental programs in the smaller institutions and experimental colleges in the large universities are exciting indications of the kinds of things that should be tried, for in them there is effort to return to the human dimension in higher education. There must be increasing individualization of the college curriculum, perhaps a varied, multi-track system which will enable each student to discover and proceed at his own pace. An increased voice for students in educational policy-making will help maintain an openness in these matters, and this is coming, too.

But significant change will come slowly in Southern colleges and universities, as C. P. Snow says is true in England:[20]

> In a society like ours, academic patterns change more slowly than any others. In my lifetime, in England, they have crystallized rather than loosened. I used to think that it would be about as hard to change, say, the Oxford and Cambridge scholarship examination as to conduct a major revolution. I now believe that I was over-optimistic.

Evans and Leppmann give the same witness:[21] "To a considerable extent, the university community has been successful in resisting change, even though a dynamic and far more complex society has evolved around it."

Mayhew has suggested some of the barriers which will stand in the way of academic change:[22] (1) professorial inertia, (2) the reward system (failure to reward effective teaching), (3) lack of knowledge about successful teaching, (4) conflicting

---

[20] C. P. Snow, "Miasma, Darkness, and Torpidity," *New Statesman*, XLII (No. 1587), 1961, p. 186.

[21] Richard I. Evans and Peter K. Leppmann, *Resistance to Innovation in Higher Education* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 4.

[22] Lewis B. Mayhew, *Innovation in Collegiate Instruction: Strategies for Change* (Research Monograph Series, Southern Regional Education Board, 1968).

professorial roles, i.e., teaching, research and service, (5) increasing institutional complexity, (6) faulty communication within the institution, (7) confusion regarding functions of the several types of institutions, and (8) the academic conscience *"a la* Calvinism."

Certainly many things, which have been assumed to be academically sacred and the best ways of accomplishing purposes, should be questioned during the next 20 years.

Among these items are such matters as the traditional concept of credit hours and quality points, the accepted length of time required for graduation, conventional grading systems, the lecture method, ideas of what is suitable and what is not suitable for academic credit, desirable class-size in each field of study, what is and is not appropriate in a liberal arts college, the usual criteria and standards for admission to a college, the procedure of teaching in watertight compartments called disciplines, the idea that the only significant heritage comes from Western civilization, narrow regional or national provincialism in curriculum, prejudice against "hardware" as aids in learning, unwillingness to allow undergraduate students to engage in independent study and research, commitment to one of the traditional kinds of academic calendar, academic prejudice against the two-year community college, commitment to traditional principles of class scheduling, failure to recognize the importance of off-campus volunteer experience coordinated with learning, failure to realize that mature undergraduate students are among the best teachers of other undergraduates, commitment to a rigidly prescribed curriculum, failure to recognize the need for special programs for the disadvantaged as well as the talented, and failure to make residence halls something more than hotels for overnight accommodation.

Actually, many colleges and universities in the South are in a state of ferment, encouraged in part by the self-study requirements of the regional accrediting agencies. All of the traditions, blind spots and rigidities suggested above are being questioned in at least a few institutions, and what is more important, changes are being made. The next 20 years must and probably will be characterized by soundly conceived and carefully implemented academic innovations on many fronts if

higher education is to work effectively with contemporary students and keep up with changes in the larger society.

Institutional Management

The important results of higher education, of course, are found in what happens to students, what kind of research is produced, and what kind of services are offered. College and university management is important because it can and does materially affect the achievement of educational purposes. Institutions should function as close to maximum effectiveness and efficiency as possible. While some Southern colleges and universities have incorporated latest management theory and practice into their operations, most have not. Especially do the smaller institutions show great opportunity for improvement in administration. Many have been operated under benevolent despots, others quite loosely controlled.

The trend toward rationalization of college management should be accelerated. As institutions grow in size, as professors become more aggressive, as students demand more participation in decision-making, as institutions are forced into diversified statewide patterns of higher education, as automation of data processing proceeds, as the cost squeeze becomes more acute, as society makes greater demands on higher education—as these and other changes occur—the organization and management of Southern colleges and universities must be altered considerably.

Management in higher education cannot be equated with that in a business, industry, hospital or the military. True, all are complex organizations involving assigned statuses and roles, differentiation of functions, goals, authority, rewards, sanctions, morale of personnel, values and traditions. But in values, in criteria for measuring performance and in authority, the college or university must be different. Such an institution is not run for profit. And it is not popular to try to evaluate the most significant activity of its professional personnel—teaching. Furthermore, it is difficult to judge the quality of the product.

Only a few of the aspects of college management will be mentioned—those matters to which most attention should be given over the next 20 years. These involve trustee-faculty-

student relationships, communication, business management and planning.

Most institutions need to improve their ways of working with trustees. Too frequently the governing board is not effectively involved in understanding the affairs of the college and in evolving significant policy. On the other hand, trustees sometimes involve themselves in matters of administration rather than policy. Trustees must understand that their chief responsibility is legislative, not executive. Most presidents need to learn how to work more effectively with trustee boards and committees.

State institutions in the South too frequently have had difficulties in trustee-legislature relationships. For private institutions, the problem has been with trustee-church relationships. In each instance, there may be a threat to the policy-making authority which must reside in trustees for two reasons: First, trustee authority is the only sound arrangement because only a board of trustees has the continuity and time for study which are required for carefully considered policy decisions. And second, this principle must be followed to meet accreditation standards. It is likely that there are continuing political and church-related problems ahead for Southern higher education, but there are signs that progress is being made in this respect.

In matters of academic freedom, Southern institutions too frequently have been found wanting. The 1940 statement by the American Association of University Professors, approved by several national educational organizations, defines the faculty member's freedom of teaching and investigation, and prescribes policies and procedures for (1) award of tenure to faculty and (2) termination of employment. This statement (or its successor) must be accepted by the trustees and administrators of colleges and universities unless they are to remain in some backwater eddy of American higher education. It is probable that the statement will be revised soon so as to take into account changes in society and on the campuses since 1940.

In some of the strongest universities and colleges, there has been a long tradition of extensive faculty participation in governance of the institution. This has recently been formulated afresh in a joint document issued by the AAUP and various

higher educational associations. Opportunity for faculty participation is demanded in the determination of educational policy, institutional planning, budgeting, choice of a president and academic officers, curriculum, methods of instruction, research, academic appointments, promotions, award of tenure, dismissal, and salary increases for academic personnel. Too many Southern institutions are not functioning in ways consistent with these provisions. Movement of higher education management in this direction must come and will improve administrative decisions, faculty morale and the faculty recruitment image of Southern institutions.

Faculty members, on the other hand, generally feel more commitment to their discipline or even to a government funding agency than to the institution which employs them. Assumption by faculty of a greater feeling of responsibility to the college or university also needs to be encouraged.

Demerath, Stephens and Taylor have recently provided a provocative research volume which throws light on these matters.[23] They conclude that the key to more effective management in higher education is not to be found in more formal organization or in more line administrators with greater official authority. Certainly, formal structure is necessary. Yet there is need for a "complementary social ordering that is designed to make university management more responsive to the needs and interests of academicians." The authors call for "clear and known procedures for consultation, communication and decision which serve to make easier and greater the faculty's participation in policy-making. . . . To create and utilize such procedures in a university is to collegialize its management." They espouse more faculty responsibility in goal-setting and policy-making for teaching, research and service. Faculty committees, they find, are often ineffective, either because they are outside the policy-making sphere, even in a consultative role, or they are mistakenly assigned executive functions. The authors further conclude that "the departments of better universities are collegial domains in which power is quite widely shared, and the chairman seldom acts on his own."

[23] N. J. Demerath, Richard W. Stephens, and R. Robb Taylor, *Power, Presidents, and Professors* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1967).

Students, too, are being given a greater hand in management. The concept of academic freedom of students is relatively new, but already there is a joint statement on this subject, "Rights and Freedoms of Students," developed by the AAUP and the Association of American Colleges, among others. With reference to management, the statement says: "The student body should have clearly defined means to participate in the formulation and application of institutional policy affecting academic and student affairs. The role of the student government within the areas of its jurisdiction should be reviewed only through orderly and prescribed procedures." The practice of appointing students to full membership on most faculty and administrative committees is not new, but it is sure to be adopted by many more Southern institutions over the next 20 years. However, firm administrative policies will be required to preserve law and order on the campus, to protect the rights of all to speak and to be heard, to prohibit violence, and to protect the educational functioning of the institution. Colleges and universities must not allow agitation to replace education. While there should be no question of the students "taking over," it is clear that opportunity for proper participation in areas in which they have competence can improve institutional management and lead to increased assumption of proper responsibility by students.

Even with widespread faculty and student participation, internal and external communication is always a management problem, no less in higher education than in other organizations. There must be both *formal* and *informal* methods of communication between and among the principal participants—trustees, administrators, faculty, non-academic staff, students, alumni, citizens of the host community, and other special publics. A spirit of openness should characterize the campus and be reflected in communication policies and methods. But communication is time-consuming and expensive and, therefore, often neglected. Frequently there is lack of know-how or understanding of its importance by educational administrators. The attention of modern communication specialists is needed by most colleges and universities.

Many small colleges—and some large universities, for that

matter—are especially weak in management of their business affairs. Though even here the educational enterprise is different from a business, because the purpose is something quite different from profit, still many sound business policies and practices from economic institutions are generally applicable in higher education. But the officer in charge of business affairs must be committed to the goals of the institution fully as much as are the president and the chief academic officer. Sound procedures for budget formulation; budget control; cost accounting, especially in the academic area; non-academic personnel recruitment, training and supervision; purchasing; equipment inventory; analysis of space utilization; and automatic data processing are badly needed in most Southern institutions. A college should operate with economy and efficiency no less than any other organization. Furthermore, thanks largely to McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, there is now broad awareness that trustees should give greater care, imagination and boldness to their responsibility for endowment investment as an accommodation to economic trends.

Finally, colleges and universities in the South should become more experienced in advance planning such as that encouraged by the Ford Foundation. It is helpful to differentiate, as Bower does, between strategic planning and operational planning. Comprehensive, strategic planning is different from operational planning as military strategy differs from tactics.[24] Planning by the faculty, the top administrative team, and the trustees of a college or university should be strategic. As the broad strategy is outlined, the administration develops various operational plans or tactics.

Goal-setting in operational terms is sometimes neglected. Too frequently, the mission of the institution is unclear, the catalogue statement merely a series of platitudes. Trustees, faculty and administration should collaborate in formulating a statement which is subject to clear interpretation. The goals must be carefully determined so as to reflect for the particular institution a proper balance between teaching at the several levels, research and service to the larger community.

---

[24] Marvin Bower, *The Will to Manage* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), p. 47.

Operational plans constitute the implementation of strategic planning, which in turn leads to the differentiation between the concept of objectives and goals. Goals, whether defined by administrators, trustees or legislatures, are more enduring and are never fully achieved. They describe the broad mission of the institution and are basic to strategic planning. Objectives are specific targets for planning detailed action. They describe the what, when and how.

Kingman Brewster of Yale wrote in his annual report of 1964-65:

> Your trustees, the President and Fellows of the Yale Corporation, need a strategy of ends and means if they are to give Yale direction and are to appraise Yale's course from month to month and from year to year. . . . One impetus for developing a strategy is the need for priorities by which to ration scarce resources. . . . Another consideration which must pervade any strategic thinking is a continuous examination of our inherent and inherited comparative advantages and disadvantages. . . . Educational wisdom and parsimony alike compel attention to the obvious fact that we can do some things . . . better than, or not as well as, others do them. . . . These ways of thinking . . . describe the proper cast of mind for those who are responsible for the direction of the University as a whole.[25]

What of the internal mechanics of institutional planning? First, the trustees and the president must fix accountability for strategic planning in the executives of the institution—those who are in the line structure of the organization, with the chief executive primarily responsible. This is a responsibility that the president cannot delegate. In large institutions, one frequently finds a staff assistant or vice president for planning who, at a high level of ability and salary, is responsible for coordinating the planning of the institution. But he really functions as staff to the president, because in the president's office must lie the primary responsibility for long-range planning. Also the business officer is a key member of the strategic planning team and must be committed to the academic objectives and goals of the institution. After accountability for planning is fixed, strategic planning must be divided into such areas as recruitment and

[25] Kingman Brewster, Jr., "Perspective for Planning," *Yale University Annual Report*, 1964-65, pp. 54-55.

admission of students, faculty and staff compensation, library resources, curriculum development, research and facilities. Actually, it is concerning facilities that planning is most easily accomplished, while academic planning and innovation are the most difficult because faculties tend to be conservative.

But successful planning requires research on the operations of the institution to provide much of the data on which plans can be based. Institutional research is a new function for many colleges in the South and should be greatly strengthened over the next 20 years with the employment of well-trained research staff.

Strategic planning in these and other areas in the college should result in a grand design for the institution of the future; however, this design should remain at the level of strategy with emphasis upon carefully defined goals. Then the tactics are formulated by the administrative staff; the operational objectives for each part of the college are stated in concrete terms for one or two years, fitting into the long-range strategic planning.

It is essential, then, that institutional management in the South be greatly improved in the next 20 years if Southern colleges and universities are to maximize their contributions in relation to the support provided. The role of trustees must be more clearly defined, and their work made more effective. Academic freedom needs to be better understood and more widely supported. Faculty and student participation in institutional governance must be extended. Varied internal communication techniques must be employed. Modern tools of business management must be introduced. And finally, long-range strategic planning and more immediate operational planning must become well-integrated parts of the orderly functioning of Southern colleges and universities. Through these avenues of management improvement, the region's higher education purposes can be more fully realized.